



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It has nothing to do with the appositive participle, but doubtless grew out of the dative absolute construction. It differs, however, from the dative absolute and the more modern nominative absolute, in that, though preserving the form of the latter, it has shaken off the adverbial function and denotes neither time, manner, cause, condition, nor concession.

Other illustrations of the general principle that I have endeavored to outline will suggest themselves to the reader. Enough have been given, I believe, to show that a dominant characteristic of English syntax, a characteristic that differentiates it sharply from the syntax of Latin, is its insistent tendency to operate at close quarters, to span only limited areas, and to make its laws of concord depend not so much on logic as on proximity. English syntax is essentially a syntax of short circuits.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH.

University of North Carolina.

BEOWULF, 62.

The confused passage in *Beowulf* centering in l. 62 has given rise to two classes of emendations. The first rests on the supposition that there is a mistake in the word *elan*; the second supposes that there is an omission after *cwen*. I wish to show that it is the second class of emendation that is in the right. The lines just preceding the confused place tell us that Healfdene had four children. The names of the three sons are given as assured fact and present no difficulty, but the passage dealing with the fourth child is confused, and the composer by his method of statement gives some ground for the belief that the confusion may be partly due to his own uncertainty of information. *Hyrde ic*, is the way he begins the confused passage,—

b[æt] *elan cwen heaðo-scilfingas heals-gebedda.*

The confusion in this clause may be partly due to uncertainty of information, but surely that is not the only cause for the trouble. The passage not only seems lacking in at least one proper name, but it also has no verb, and it contains a probable

genitive ending in *as*. How are we to deal with it? Ettmüller and others believe that *Elan* is the name of the daughter of Healfdene, and they better the passage by supplying a verb and the conjectured name of the husband after *cwen*. This is the simplest solution and I believe it is the correct one. But others, such as Grundtvig, Bugge, and Kluge, believe that *elan* is the genitive ending in the name of the husband, whose name they reconstruct, and then supply a verb and a conjectured name for the wife. The latter emendators say that *elan* can hardly be a proper name, since it does not occur elsewhere in Old English. The name, however, according to Heine, is found in Old High German, and in any case such an objection loses most of its weight when we recollect that all we know about the name of Beowulf is to be found in the manuscript under discussion.

But now there is another interesting point to consider. The word *heaðo* is written over an erasure. Zupitza, in his autotype edition, does not mention it, but there can be little doubt of the fact. What I say I base on a study of two copies of the facsimile. The raggedness of the letters in *heaðo* and, better yet, the remains of some of the letters of the earlier word are strong enough evidence to support my assertion. The word *cwen* is near the edge of the manuscript and not much can be stated about it from a study of the facsimile, but *elan* is farther in and is perfectly distinct and shows not the slightest trace of any erasure. The bearing of this upon the work of emendation ought to be evident. It shows that, whatever may have been the remote cause for the confusion in this passage, the immediate cause centers in this erasure in the manuscript. The scribal mistake was not in the letters *elan*, but farther on in the word after *cwen*. It is impossible from the facsimile to make out with certainty any of the letters underneath *heaðo*, unless perchance it is an *s* apparently at the end of the erased word. This *s* tends to show that the word erased was a genitive, but, inasmuch as the word must have been wrong to be erased, it will not help much in the emendation to determine it more definitely. It is, then, in the place after *cwen* that all emendations must be made if they are really to better the passage. This conclusion

throws out of consideration one of the two classes of emendations mentioned above.

FRANK E. BRYANT.

University of Kansas.

HROTHULF.

Among the many changes in the last edition of Heyne's *Beowulf*, Ettmüller's long-standing emendation of the lacuna in l. 63, *Ongentheowes wæs*, has at last given place to Kluge's reading, [*Sigeneow wæs Sæw*] *elan cwen*, thus filling the line which with its context stood thus:

*þæm feower bearn forð-gerimed
in worold wocun, weoroda ræswa
Heorogar, ond Hroðgar ond Halga til,
hyrde ic, þæt Elan cwen
Heaðo-Scilfingas healsgebedda.*

In one respect, at least, this change is an advantage. It omits a name which beyond the fact that it belonged to a Scylfing, alliterated with *Elan*, and was convenient, had no claim to the place it occupied so long. In other respects the case for the new reading is not so clear. It has distinguished authority behind it, and it agrees with the latest attempt to correlate closely the sagas and the *Beowulf*. But there is one respect in which it, like the earlier suggestion of Bugge, [*N. N. wæs On*] *elan cwen*, has one serious defect. Textual emendation, if it is to be of value, must emend the text, and in the present instance, as I think Mr. Bryant demonstrates, these readings emend not the text as we have it but a place in the text concerning which there need be no question at all, as it has neither lacuna nor obscure reading. What is needed is not a correction before but after the word *cwen*.

My attention having been called by Mr. Bryant to the evident scribal error and erasure in the ms., it occurred to me, upon some consideration, that the various emendations which regarded *Elan* as the end of a compound name neglected one important element in the solution of the problem, namely, how the omission came about.

It would seem more natural, in other words, to assume that the mistake came where the ms. shows

that it came, and that it was due to some confusing combination of letters which threw the eye off its regular course. Pursuing this idea I arranged the passage to show this in its most graphic form, thus :

*Heorogar ond Hroðgar
ond Halga til
hyrde ic þæt Elan cwen
.
Heaðo-scilfingas
healsgebedda.*

Now, it is evident from this that to any one copying such a series of lines or half lines, whether definitely indicated on the ms. or not, there would be a great danger of skipping one set, and that danger would be much increased if, for any reason, the writer's attention was diverted from the actual business of copying. Such an experience is so common to us all as to need no proof. If we examine the ms. we shall see that this is exactly what occurred. The erasure and rewriting which give the effect of a palimpsest at precisely this point gives the additional opportunity for just this error. It seems, then, in the highest degree probable that the missing name began with another *H*, and that when the scribe again took up his work after correcting his error, he began with the wrong one, continuing with *Heaðo-scylfingas*. Now if we look at the ms. we find the lines divided thus, bearing out this idea exactly :

*Hroðgar ond Halga til hyrde ic þæt Elan cwen
Heaðo scilfingas healsgebedda.*

If, as I assume, *Hroðulfes wæs* followed *cwen*, it would have come directly under *Hroðgar ond*. In that event precisely the mistake indicated would have occurred in the copy, the eye thrown off by the two *Hroð*-syllables, would have continued with the next, and incorrect *H*-word. The question, immediately arises, granting this explanation of the scribal error to be true, what was this missing name beginning with *H*? or is there one in the poem which could be used in this place? The question is, fortunately, quickly answered. There is one character of much apparent importance but who has previously been assigned a doubtful relationship and one which, but poorly supported as it is by external evidence, is out of accord with other evidence we have concerning